Registered No. M.—1175

362

The Mysore Gazette.

Vol. 56.] PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY. [No. 35.

BANGALORE, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1921.

PART III.

Legislative Measures and Rules thereunder.

NOTIFICATIONS.

No. J. 938—*Legis.* 4-21-2, *dated* 24*th August* 1921.

Under Section 11 of the Mysore Motor Vehicles Regulation, IV of 1913, the Government of His Highness the Maharaja are pleased to prohibit on the Hassan-Chikmagalur Road, and the Bangalore-Mangalore Road from Channarayapatna to Saklespur, the letting or plying for hire of any motor vehicles, except under a permit granted under the aforesaid Regulation.

By Order,
B. RAMASWAMAIYA,
Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department.

No. J. 1242—*Legis.* 35-20-4, *dated* 30*th August* 1921.

Under Section 9 of the Mysore Motor Vehicles Regulation, 1913, Government are pleased to direct that in Rule 2 of the Mysore Motor Vehicles Rules, 1914, as amended by Government Notification No. G. 871—Legis. 11-16-29, dated 16th July 1918, the words "or in the dominions of His Exalted Highness the Nizam" shall be inserted after the words "the Civil and Military Station, Bangalore".

By Order,
B. RAMASWAMAIYA,
Secretatry to Government,
Revenue Department.

362

No. J. 855—*Legis.* 27-17, *dated* 20*th August* 1921.

Under Rule 40 of the Rules for the conduct of business of the Mysore Legislative Council, the following Report of the Select Committee on the Mysore Prevention of Adulteration Bill is published for general information.

By Order,
P. MAHADEVAYYA,
Secretary,
Mysore Legislative Council.

Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the Mysore Prevention of Adulteration Bill.

We, the undersigned members of the Select Committee to which the Mysore Prevention of Adulteration Bill was referred, have carefully considered the provisions of the Bill and have now the honor to submit the following report:—

Clause 5.—We recommend the omission of Proviso (iii) to Sub-Clause (i) as it is liable to be abused by unscrupulous men in order to evade the law and as the other provisos make adequate provision for the safety of *bona-fide* tradesmen. Proviso (iv) may in consequence be renumbered as proviso (iii).

Clause 10.—The offence contemplated in the clause is obviously the *unlawful* removal or interference with an article secured by the local executive officer under clause 9. In order to make this point clear, we suggest the insertion of the word "unlawfully" between the words "shall" and "remove".

These alterations do not affect the main principles upon which the Bill has been framed and we do not therefore consider it necessary to republish the Bill as revised.

(Subject to a minute of dissent)
- Mir Hamza Husein.
- C. S. Doraswamy Iyer.
- M. Subbaiya.
- H. Venkataramaiya.
- Dewan Bahadur K. P. Puttanna Chetty.
- M. C. Rangaiengar.

Minute of dissent by Mr. C. S. Doraswamy Iyer.

I regret I am unable to agree with the Report of the Select Committee in its entirety. I cannot see my way to delete proviso (iii) to Clause 5 (i) of the Bill. The object of the Bill, as I understand it, is to prevent adulteration of foodstuffs by legislation. Though there is no definition of adulteration in the Bill itself, it appears to me that what is primarily aimed at is to check the sale of food or drink which in the ordinary acceptation of the term will be regarded as 'noxious', 'unwholesome', 'deleterious', 'injurious to health' or, 'unfit for human consumption'; in fact, the prohibition of the sale of foodstuffs which are not genuine is the main idea underlying the provisions of the Bill. There can no doubt be an admixture without rendering the food or drink noxious, but under the general penal provisions now in force, the sale of such an article is not punishable.

2. Under Special Acts, such as the Municipal Regulation, No. VII of 1906, sale of foodstuffs which are other than what